



DEAN D. EFSTATHIOU, Acting Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
<http://dpw.lacounty.gov>

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

September 2, 2008

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: PD-3

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
WITH CONSTRUCTION OF MISSING SIDEWALK
FOR THE BREA CANYON CUTOFF ROAD
AT HOUSE NUMBER 1418 ET AL., PROJECT
IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF ROWLAND HEIGHTS
(SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 4)
(3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

This action is to adopt the Negative Declaration and authorize the Department of Public Works to proceed with the Brea Canyon Cutoff Road at House Number 1418, et al., project in the unincorporated area of Rowland Heights in the County of Los Angeles.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for the proposed project to construct missing sidewalk for the Brea Canyon Cutoff Road at House Number 1418 et al., in the unincorporated area of Rowland Heights, together with any comments received during the public review period; find on the basis of the whole record before your Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment; find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of your Board; and adopt the Negative Declaration.

2. Approve the project and authorize the Acting Director of Public Works or his designee to proceed with the preconstruction phase of the project, including approval of design plans and right-of-way acquisition.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval of the recommended actions will adopt the Negative Declaration (ND) and authorize the Department of Public Works to proceed with this project to construct new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road at House Numbers 1418 and 1530.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The Countywide Strategic Plan directs the provision of Service Excellence (Goal 1) and Children and Families' Well-Being (Goal 5). This action will improve safety for children and pedestrians, thereby improving the quality of life in the County of Los Angeles.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There will be no impact to the County's General Fund.

The proposed project including filing fees is estimated at \$190,000. The Fourth Supervisorial District's Road Construction Program in the Fiscal Year 2008-09 Road Fund Budget includes \$40,000 and the Special Road District No. 4 Fund Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09 includes \$150,000 to finance the project cost.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the pedestrian access to Ybarra Elementary School along the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road.

An environmental impact analysis/document is a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental effects of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, the Department of Public Works is also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of CEQA.

The project involves constructing new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The proposed work includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, and a driveway, and pave out of the street area in front of House Numbers 1418 and 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors (Initial Study), it was determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the attached ND is recommended.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

An Initial Study was prepared for the project in compliance with CEQA. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, a ND was prepared. A public notice was published in the *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* on April 30, 2008, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092. Copies of the draft ND for public review were provided to the Rowland Heights Library and were available at our headquarters building in Alhambra. Notices regarding the availability of the draft ND were also mailed to residents within the vicinity of the project. No comments were received.

The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of the proceedings upon which your Board's decision is based in this matter is the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, 11th Floor, Alhambra, California 91803. The custodian of such documents and materials is the Environmental Planning and Assessments Section, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

The Department of Fish and Game has determined that for purposes of the assessment of CEQA filing fees, Section 711.4(c) of the Fish and Game Code, the project has no potential effect on fish, wildlife, and habitat and does not require payment of a CEQA filing fee. The CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination Form was approved by the Department of Fish and Game on June 4, 2007. Upon your Board's approval of the ND, the Department of Public Works will file a Notice of Determination in accordance with Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code and pay the required filing fee with the Registrar-Recorder\County Clerk in the amount of \$50.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)


The proposed project will improve pedestrian access to Ybarra Elementary School along the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
September 2, 2008
Page 4

CONCLUSION

Please return one adopted copy of this letter to the Department of Public Works,
Programs Development Division.

Respectfully submitted,


DEAN D. EFSTATHIOU
Acting Director of Public Works

DDE:SA:re

Attachment

c: Chief Executive Office
County Counsel

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
BREA CANYON CUTOFF ROAD AT HOUSE NUMBER 1418, ET AL.**

I. Location and Brief Description

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works is proposing to construct new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road in the unincorporated area of Rowland Heights in the County of Los Angeles. The proposed work includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, and a driveway, and pave out of the street area in front of House Number 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The proposed work at House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road involves constructing 100 feet of missing sidewalk. The additional sidewalk construction in front of House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road may not be included in the final design of the project. Further information is required to determine the feasibility of including the work in front of House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road as part of the final design. For the purpose of the Initial Study, it will be included as part of the project. The construction of the sidewalk will require the removal of nine trees. There is one oak tree to be removed that has a diameter less than 6 inches.

The purpose of the project is to make it safer for children to access Ybarra Elementary School by constructing new sidewalk on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant effects are identified.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study and Attachment A, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

RS:re

P:\PDPUB\EP&A\EU\PROJECTS\BREA CYN CUTOFF ROAD\1A-ND.DOC

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Brea Canyon Cutoff Road at House Number 1418, et al.
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 11th Floor, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ms. Reyna Soriano (626) 458-5192.
4. **Project Location:** 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road and 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road in the County of Los Angeles unincorporated area of Rowland Heights.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
6. **General Plan Designation:** County of Los Angeles General Plan.
7. **Zoning:** Light Agricultural.
8. **Description of Project:** The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works is proposing to construct new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road in the County of Los Angeles unincorporated area of Rowland Heights. The proposed work includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, and a drive way, and pave out of the street area in front of House Number 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The proposed work at House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road involves constructing 100 feet of missing sidewalk. The additional sidewalk construction in front of House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road may not be included in the final design of the project. Further information is required to determine the feasibility of including the work in front of House Number 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road as part of the final design. For purpose of the Initial Study, it will be included as part of the project. The construction of the sidewalk will require the removal of nine trees. There is one oak tree to be removed that has a diameter less than 6-inches.

The purpose of the project is to make it safer for children to access Ybarra Elementary School by constructing new sidewalk on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**
 - A. **Project Site** - Brea Canyon Cutoff Road is a residential street. The roadway is striped for one travel lane in each direction. Vegetation in the project area consists of ornamental vegetation.
 - B. **Surrounding Properties** - The surrounding properties consist of commercial buildings, shops, a school, a church, and single-family residential properties. Wildlife in the area is limited to domestic animals, birds, and insects.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):**

None

RS:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant impact or potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

Reyna Soriano

Printed Name

4/29/08

Date

LACDPW

For

The map displays a section of Diamond Bar, California, with a focus on the 'Project Site'. The site is located at the intersection of E Pinaro St and E Walnut Dr, marked by a red circle. Major roads shown include E Valley Blvd, E San Jose Ave, E Walnut Dr, E Pinaro St, and E Pinaro St. The map also shows the Los Angeles River and the Orange River. A north arrow is located in the bottom right corner. The map includes labels for various streets and landmarks, such as the Los Angeles River, the Orange River, and the Diamond Bar area.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references, information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans and zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

BREA CANYON CUTOFF ROAD AT HOUSE NUMBER 1418, ET AL.

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:					
	a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:					
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> - Would the project:					
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:					
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES					
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i)	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. RECREATION-					
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:					
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of then applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANCE EFFECTS					
<p>Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified.</p>					

ATTACHMENT A

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

BREA CANYON CUTOFF ROAD AT HOUSE NUMBER 1418, ET AL.

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No impact. The proposed project is not within proximity of any scenic vistas.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any scenic resources or any State scenic highway.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less than significant impact. The proposed project consists of constructing new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The proposed work includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, a drive way, and pave out of the street area in front of 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. Proposed work may also include construction of missing sidewalk on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road near the intersection of Fairway Drive in front of 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. Sidewalk construction will require removal of eight trees including one Oak tree that has a diameter less than 6-inches in front of 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road and one tree in front of 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The primary visual change will result from removing the trees. This visual change will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding. Addition of the sidewalk would be consistent with the existing surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings will be less than significant.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

No impact. The project would not include additional lighting systems or structures that could result in glare. Therefore, the project will have no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

II. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:**

- a) ***Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***
- b) ***Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***
- c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project location is zoned for light agricultural use. The project site area is not occupied by prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance and is not located within existing agriculture operations. Thus, the project will not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Further, no part of the project site or adjacent areas is subject to the Williamson Act. No agricultural resources impacts will occur.

III. **AIR QUALITY - Would the project:**

- a) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No impact. Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- b) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities would be restricted to the construction times allowed by the County of Los Angeles, except during emergency situations. The contractor is required to comply with all applicable air pollution control laws, such as diesel particulate matter control measures applicable to construction vehicles as set forth in Article 4 of Chapter 1, Division 3, Title 13, California Code of Regulations. The proposed project would produce greenhouse gases during the construction; however the activities would adhere to all applicable air quality plans of the Air Quality Management District. The impacts on global warming resulting from the short term construction activity associated with this project are accordingly considered to be less than significant.

- c) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

Less than significant impact. The emissions generated as a result of the proposed project will occur only during construction. These emissions would be temporary and are not expected to result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with Federal and State emission control regulations. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the ambient air quality.

- d) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less than significant impact. Sensitive receptors in the area may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emissions during the project construction. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations. The impact is considered to be less than significant since exposure would be temporary and precautions will be taken to minimize exposure to pollutants.

- e) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated by diesel trucks used for the construction of the project. These types of odors will be short-term and temporary. Therefore, the impact of creating objectionable odors is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. No sensitive or special status species, or any species identified as a candidate in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are present in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur.

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

No impact. There are no migratory wildlife corridors located at the proposed project location. The project would be constructed in a developed residential area. Also, the project is not proposed within a watercourse of any fish habitat. Therefore, there will be no impact on resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

Less than significant impact. No known locally protected biological resources exist at the project site. The sidewalk construction requires removal of eight trees located in front of 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road and one tree located in front of 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The tree removal consists of one tree with a diameter less than 6-inches, four Yucca trees, and various other species. The project site is located in urbanized and developed area. Although the specific tree species have not been identified, it is not likely the project site contains naturally occurring tree species. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on biological resources protected by local policies or ordinances is considered less than significant.

- f) ***Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

No impact. No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

- a-d) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or geologic feature, or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?***

Less than significant impact. No known paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources exist in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor shall cease the project and contact a specialist to examine the project site as required by project specifications. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources are less than significant.

VI. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the proposal:**

- a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

- i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

No impact. There are no known active faults underlying the project site and project activities would not expose people or structures to adverse effects from a fault rupture occurring at the project site.

- ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

No impact. The project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquakes and, therefore, the project activities are not associated with factors that are known to trigger a strong seismic ground shaking.

- iii) ***Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

Less than significant impact. The project area is within a known area of liquefaction as designated by the California Geological Survey

of the California Department of Conservation, but the proposed project does not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to any seismic-related ground failure. Thus, the proposed project will have less than significant impact on liquefaction or seismic-related ground failure.

iv) Landslides?

No impact. The project location is in a residential area, consisting of flat terrain; it does not contain any geologic features (i.e., hills or mountains), which may adversely cause landslides. Therefore, the project will have no impact on landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than significant impact. The improvements will result in the disruption of a limited amount of soil, but this does not constitute a significant impact related to soil erosion or substantial topsoil loss. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly compact the earth and properly dispose of any excess excavated material. The existing topography will not be significantly altered by the construction. Therefore, the impact on soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be considered less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No impact. The soil would not become unstable as a direct result of the project. Thus, proposed project is not expected to impact on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No impact. The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No impact. This project does not generate sanitary wastewater. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b-c) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact. The nearest school is Ybarra Elementary School, located adjacent to the project site. Combustion engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in hazardous emissions or a hazardous substance spillage, thus the project impact on the public or environment is considered to be less than significant.

- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

No impact. The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on hazardous materials.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. The proposed project will have no impact on safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact relating to airstrip safety for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, a drive way and pave out of the street area. Construction may require temporary lane closure, but project specifications will require the contractor to give advance notice of any street closures and detours to all emergency service agencies if street closures become necessary. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is considered less than significant.

- h) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The project site is located in a very high fire hazard zone, but surrounding land uses are primarily developed and do not pose any fire hazard risk to the project site. Construction activities will not expose users to fire hazard from flammable brush, grass or trees. Therefore, there would be no impact.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- a) ***Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

No impact. The proposed project is not within a watercourse and is, therefore, not anticipated to have an effect on the water quality standards or waste discharge requirements within a water body. Additionally the contractor will be required to implement Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to minimize construction impacts on water quality. In complying, the project will have no impact on the water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not result in the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table. Thus, no impacts to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge are expected to occur.

- c-d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will involve construction of new curb, gutter, and sidewalks. The construction does not represent a significant change in the topography of the ground surface. Construction of the curb and gutter will increase the efficiency of drainage from the project site while reducing any possible erosion or siltation on or off site. Therefore, the proposed project will have less than significant impact on erosion, siltation, or on the rate of surface runoff.

- e) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

Less than significant impact. The sidewalk construction will result in additional surface water runoff. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact on the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

- f) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

No impact. The contractor will adhere to applicable Best Management Practices to minimize any degradation to water quality during construction. The project will not impact or degrade water quality.

- g) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood, which would impede or redirect flood flows.

- i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

No impact. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No impact. The proposed project will not cause any inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

- a) *Physically divide an established community?***

No impact. The proposed project consists of constructing new sidewalk at two locations on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. The proposed work includes construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter, a drive way, and pave out of the street area in front of 1418 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. Proposed work may also include construction of missing sidewalk on the east side of Brea Canyon Cutoff Road near the intersection of Fairway Drive in front of 1530 Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. No new roads or physical barriers will be constructed. The project will not physically divide the physical arrangement of the established community.

- b) *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

No impact. The proposed project will not change the designation or zoning of the project area. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.

- c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

No impact. The proposed project would not deplete any mineral resource and would therefore, have no impact on mineral resources.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

No impact. The project site is not identified as a resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction activities. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County of Los Angeles noise control ordinance. Overall, since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels; thus, the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project would require the use of equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise vibration. However, the project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project would be considered less than significant since construction would be for a short period and would not expose people to long-term excessive noise levels.

- c) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

No impact. There will be no substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level due to the project. The project will have no impact on permanent noise increases.

- d) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less than significant impact. During the construction phase of the project, there will be a nominal increase in existing noise levels due to construction and transportation of material to and from the project site. Construction activities will be limited to normal County regulated hours. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact from ambient noise levels will be less than significant.

- e-f) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airport land or a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

- a) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

No impact. The proposed project would facilitate pedestrian access to Ybarra Elementary School by constructing missing sidewalk, but will not induce population growth.

- b-c) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses nor displace people, which may create a demand for housing. The project will have no impact on housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the project:

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

No impact. The goal of the proposed project is to improve the pedestrian access. Thus, the project will not affect public services. Physical changes resulting from the project would be confined to the project area and would not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, school, maintenance of public facilities, or other governmental services.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the project:

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

- a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project may require disposal of excess material and transportation of construction equipment to the project site. The construction of the proposed project may also cause minor delay in traffic due to lane closure during construction. This could minimally increase the existing traffic in the surrounding area. However, this impact is only during construction and, therefore, is temporary and short-lived. The

impact of the project on substantial traffic increases is considered to be less than significant.

- b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The minor increase in traffic in the project area due to construction vehicles is temporary and only during construction. Overall, the project will not directly or indirectly result in any change to the level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazards. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hazards due to design features.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No impact. Emergency access will be maintained at all times. The contractor will be required to notify all emergency facilities and emergency service providers of any road closure. No road closures are foreseeable and no major traffic impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on emergency access.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

Less than significant impact. During construction of the proposed project, parking may be restricted during daylight working hours. This will be temporary and short-lived. The project specifications will require the contractor to give advance notice of parking restrictions and suggested alternatives. Therefore, the impact on inadequate parking capacity is considered less than significant.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The project does not include new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No impact. No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

- f-g) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No impact. The project will not generate any significant amount of solid waste. The project will have no impact on landfill capacity. The project will comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the project:

- a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the quality of the environment.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)***

No impact. The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

No impact. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

RS:re